31st October 1931]

(b) whether the Government are taking any steps to put an end to this system?

A.—(a) No.

(b) Does not arise.

Prisons

Alleged grievances of Mr. S. Srihari Rao in Vizagapatam jail.

* 430 *Q.*—Mr. U. C. SUBRAHMANYA BHATT: Will the hon. the Law Member be pleased to state—

(a) whether Mr. S. Srihari Rao who is now in Vizagapatam jail was treated as a special class prisoner before he was transferred to Vizagapatam and whether after he was transferred, the same treatment has been withdrawn and he is treated as an ordinary criminal; if so, why so;

(b) whether he is placed or was placed in a cell in solitary confinement in Vizagapatam jail; if so, why; and

(c) whether he has been on hunger-strike; if so, for how many days; and what is his condition; and whether the Government have investigated into the grievances which had to his hunger-strike; and what is its result, if any?

A.—(a) The prisoner has been throughout treated as an ordinary C class prisoner.

(b) The prisoner was locked up in the day time in a separate block outside the quarantine in order to prevent other prisoners being instigated by him to disobey orders.

(c) He was on hunger-strike for 66 days and his present general condition is reported to be good. The grievances which led to the hunger-strike were enquired into and the Government are satisfied that the prisoner is not entitled under the rules to the concessions claimed by him.

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" May I know, Sir, the actual necessity which led the Government to keep this prisoner in a separate block? The answer given is, ' in order to prevent other prisoners being instigated by him to disobey orders.' I want to know whether there was any such case due to which he is kept in a separate block."

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Yes."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" What was the case?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" Because it was found actually that he was instigating others to disobey orders."

Mr. ABDUL HAMEED KHAN:—" What is it that he did?"

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—" What he did was that he was instigating other prisoners to disobey orders."

[31st October 1931

B. Pocker Sahib Bahadur:—" The answer to clause (c) is, 'The grievances which led to the hunger-strike were enquired into and the Government are satisfied that the prisoner is not entitled under the rules to the concessions claimed by him.' What are the concessions claimed by him to which the Government says he is not entitled? "

The hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir M. Krishnan Nayar:—" He claimed all the concessions of an A class prisoner."

Depressed Classes

Acquisition of a strip of land for the extension of a pathway for the benefit of the Adi-Dravidas of Gopalasamudram.

*431 *Q.*—Mr. M. Devadasan: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether the Adi-Dravidas living in Panchama School street, Gopalasamudram, Tinnevelly district, applied to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Shermadevi, to the District Labour Officer, and District Collector, Tinnevelly, for the extension of their street to the main road by acquisition of a strip of land measuring 4 cents in S. No. 284/4 of the said village;

(*b*) if so, for how long they have been making that request;

(*c*) whether it is a fact that the Union Board, Gopalasamudram, passed a resolution on 20th January 1928 to the effect that a pathway should be acquired for the Adi-Dravidas;

(*d*) whether the said resolution was communicated to the Revenue Divisional Officer, Shermadevi;

(*e*) what was done thereupon;

(*f*) whether Rs. 39–1–7 and Rs. 2–4–10 were received from the Adi-Dravidas by the Government on 14th April 1920 and 18th October 1921, respectively, towards the acquisition of the land for the extension of the street;

(*g*) whether it is a fact that a further instalment of money was also required to be paid by the Adi-Dravidas in 1929; and

(*h*) why the acquisition has not yet been made?

A.—(*a*) *to* (*h*) The Government have no information but are making enquiries.

Factories

Extension of the provisions of the Indian Factories Act to private workshops.

* 432 *Q.*—Pandit Ganala Ramamurti: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether it is a fact that in view of the recent Labour Commission's enquiry presided over by the Rt. Hon. Mr. Whitley, the Government of India circularized to the local Governments that Labour legislation may be extended to various private workshops where work in wood, ivory, stone, engineering, iron, steel, brass, bell-metal, copper, silver, gold and other metals is being carried on and whether they have called for the opinion of the local Governments as to the advisability of bringing these workshops also under the operation of the